

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13, 14 remaining pending in this application. All the pending claims stand rejected. By this amendment, claim 1 is amended. Claims 3, 8 and 12 were previously canceled. Applicants request reconsideration of the application.

Rejections under §102 and §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Bergh et al. (US 6,749,814). In addition, claims 5 and 7, stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergh et al. in view of Priddy (US 6,572,814), and claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergh et al. in view of Citron et al. (US 6,586,541). Because the Bergh reference, both alone and in combination with Priddy and/or Citron fails to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1, as amended, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

To the extent the Final Office Action has re-asserted the claim rejections stated in the Office Action of January 5, 2007, Applicant wishes to direct the Office's attention to the "Amendment and Response Under 37 CFR §1.111" that was filed by facsimile by the Applicant on July 5, 2007. Without repeating all of the previous arguments, it is noted that the Remarks section of that paper includes comments and arguments that are equally applicable here.

The present Office Action asserts that the previous amendments to the claims were not commensurate in scope with the arguments asserted by Applicant. It is believed that the above claims are responsive to this issue. As the Final Office Action has conceded, Bergh does not teach introducing or changing over time of the at least one variable in a single reactor in a single experimental run. Bergh does not describe varying the residence time, pressure, etc. at different points in time within a single plug flow reactor to produce different samples of material that are collected or combined into a library of materials. Neither Priddy nor Citron compensate for these deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the issues raised in the Final Office Action. With this paper, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and the allowance of the pending claims, as amended, is now solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes a telephone conference would facilitate the resolution of one or more issues relating to this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

October 31, 2007

Date

By: Daniel R. Pastirik
Daniel R. Pastirik, Reg. No.: 33,025
Telephone No.: 651-737-2685

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833